IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

M.T., a minor by and through his grandmother	§	
and next friend, EDWINA WOODLEY, et al.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
	§	
VS.	§	C.A. NO.: 2:21-cv-00364
	§	
TATUM UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,	§	
	§	
Defendant.	§	

PLAINTIFFS' UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CONTINUE TRIAL

Plaintiffs M.T., a minor by and through his grandmother and Guardian, Edwina Woodley, and K.C., a minor by and through his mother and Guardian, Kambry Cox ("Plaintiffs") by and through their counsel of record, files this Motion to Continue as follows:

- 1. Trial in this matter is currently set to begin on April 15, 2024.
- 2. Kambry Cox, mother and Guardian of minor Plaintiff K.C. is pregnant with a due date of April 15, 2024.
- 3. Plaintiffs K.C. has standardized testing beginning on April 16, 2024 and is required to be in school.
- 4. Plaintiffs' counsel has conferred with counsel for Defendants and Defendants have agreed not to oppose Plaintiffs' motion for a continuance if the trial date is continued to at least September to account for the summer school break.

5. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court continue the trial in this matter currently set for April 15, 2024 until at least September, subject to the Court's availability.

DATED: Mar. 14, 2024

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Waukeen Q. McCoy

WAUKEEN Q. McCOY, ESQ. McCOY LAW FIRM, P.C. 251 Post Street, Suite 301 San Francisco, CA 94108 Telephone: (415) 675-7705

Facsimile: (415) 675-2530 mail@mccoyslaw.com
*Admitted *Pro hac Vice*

Brad Steele
Texas Bar No. 19099350
LAW OFFICE OF BRADLEY STEELE
1101 Judson Road
Longview, TX 75601
Tel: (903) 234-8844
brad@bradsteelelaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

Pursuant to Local Rule CV-7(h), I hereby certify that the parties have met and conferred in good faith regarding Plaintiffs' requested relief. On Tuesday, March 12, 2024, Plaintiffs' counsel asked Defendant's counsel if they would stipulate to continuing trial in this matter due to the matters discussed herein. Defendant's counsel responded on Wednesday, March 13 and indicated that they would not oppose a Motion to Continue by Plaintiffs, but could not stipulate to an exact timeframe, given the Court's docket.